arXiv:1405.4193v2 [hep-ph] 4 Jun 2014

Sizable D-term contribution as a signature of $E_6 \times SU(2)_F \times U(1)_A$ SUSY GUT model

Nobuhiro Maekawa[1,2*], Yu Muramatsu[1†] and Yoshihiro Shigekami[1‡]

[1] *Department of Physics, Nagoya University, Nagoya 464-8602, Japan*

[2] *Kobayashi Maskawa Institute, Nagoya University, Nagoya 464-8602, Japan*

Abstract

We show that the sizable D-term contributions to sfermion mass spectrum can be signatures of certain GUT, $E_6 \times SU(2)_F \times U(1)_A$ GUT. Note that these D-term contributions deviate the degenerate sfermion masses among different generations in this model. This is different from the previous works which have argued the D-term contributions, which deviate masses only between sfermions with different quantum charges, as a signature of GUT with larger rank unification group. Such D-terms are strongly constrained by the FCNC processes if the SUSY breaking scale is the weak scale. However, in $E_6 \times SU(2)_F \times U(1)_A$, natural SUSY type sfermion mass spectrum is obtained, and if the masses of $\mathbf{10}_3$ sfermions are larger than $O(1\text{TeV})$ to realize 126 GeV Higgs and the other sfermion masses are $O(10\text{TeV})$, then sizable D-term contribution is allowed. If the deviations by these D-terms can be observed in future experiments like 100 TeV proton collider or muon collider, we may confirm the $E_6 \times SU(2)_F \times U(1)_A$ GUT.

*E-mail address: maekawa@eken.phys.nagoya-u.ac.jp
†E-mail address: mura@eken.phys.nagoya-u.ac.jp
‡E-mail address: sigekami@eken.phys.nagoya-u.ac.jp

1 Introduction

Grand unified theory (GUT)[1] is one of the most promising extensions of the standard model (SM). It unifies not only three gauge interactions in the SM into a single gauge interaction, but also quarks and leptons into a few multiplets, **10** and $\bar{\mathbf{5}}$ of $SU(5)$, for example. Moreover, there are experimental supports for both unifications. For the unification of forces, measured values of three gauge couplings are consistent with the unification of gauge interactions quantitatively in the minimal supersymmetric (SUSY) SM (MSSM). For the unification of matters in $SU(5)$ GUT, if we assume that the **10** matter fields induce stronger hierarchies of Yukawa couplings than the $\bar{\mathbf{5}}$ matter fields, measured various hierarchies of quark and lepton masses and mixings can be explained qualitatively at the same time[2].

In E_6 unification[3, 4], the above assumption for the origin of the hierarchies can be derived[5]. As a result, we can obtain various realistic hierarchies of Yukawa couplings from one basic Yukawa hierarchy which realizes the hierarchy of up-type quarks. Moreover, if the family symmetry[6], $SU(3)_F$ or $SU(2)_F$, is introduced, we can obtain a model in which all three generations of quarks and leptons can be unified into a single multiplet or two multiplets, and after breaking the family symmetry and E_6 unified symmetry, realistic quark and lepton masses and mixings can be realized[7]. Such models predict a peculiar sfermion mass spectrum in which all sfermions except the third generation of the **10** matter $\mathbf{10}_3$ have universal sfermion masses. This is called modified universal sfermion masses (MUSM). When the mass of $\mathbf{10}_3$ is smaller than the other universal sfermion masses, the mass spectrum is nothing but the natural SUSY type sfermion mass spectrum[8], in which the SUSY flavor changing neutral currents (FCNC) processes are suppressed due to large sfermion masses while the weak scale is stabilized.

The most difficult problem in SUSY GUT scenario is the doublet-triplet splitting problem[9]. One pair of Higgs doublets in the MSSM can be included in $\mathbf{5}_H$ and $\bar{\mathbf{5}}_H$ with one pair of triplet (colored) Higgs. The mass of triplet Higgs must be larger than the GUT scale to stabilize the nucleon, while the mass of doublet Higgs must be around the weak scale. It is difficult to realize such a splitting without finetuning. Several ideas to solve this problem have been discussed in various models in the literature. Unfortunately, in most of the models, very small parameters are required or the terms which are allowed by the symmetry are dropped just by hand. Such a feature is in a sense a finetuning.

If the anomalous $U(1)_A$ gauge symmetry[10] is introduced, the doublet-triplet splitting problem can be solved in a natural assumption that all the interactions which are allowed by the symmetry are introduced with $O(1)$

coefficients. Note that all higher dimensional interactions which are allowed by the symmetry are introduced. Because of this natural assumption, we call the GUT scenario with the anomalous $U(1)_A$ gauge symmetry "natural GUT"[11, 12]. Note that in natural GUT the vacuum expectation value (VEV) of an operator O_i can be determined by its $U(1)_A$ charge o_i as

$$\langle O_i \rangle = \begin{cases} 0 & (o_i > 0) \\ \lambda^{-o_i} & (o_i \leq 0) \end{cases} , \tag{1}$$

where λ is determined from the Fayet-Iliopoulos parameter ξ as $\lambda \equiv \xi/\Lambda$. In this paper, we take $\lambda \sim 0.22$ and adopt the unit in which the cutoff $\Lambda = 1$. This feature is important in solving the doublet-triplet splitting problem.

If we consider the E_6 GUT with family symmetry and the anomalous $U(1)_A$ gauge symmetry at the same time, more attractive GUT model with $E_6 \times SU(2)_F \times U(1)_A$ gauge symmetry can be obtained. Since the μ problem is also solved in the natural GUT[12, 13], we can discuss the SUSY CP problem. Actually, by imposing the CP symmetry and considering the spontaneous CP violation, we can solve not only the usual SUSY CP problem but also the new SUSY CP problem on chromo-electric dipole moment (CEDM)[14] which is more serious in natural SUSY type sfermion mass spectrum[15, 16].

How to test this interesting SUSY GUT scenario? Since the unification scale is so large that it is difficult to produce GUT particles directly, it is important to examine various indirect searches. The most promising candidate for the indirect search is to find the nucleon decay. In the natural GUT, the nucleon decay via dimension 6 operators is enhanced while the nucleon decay via dimension 5 operators is suppressed[11]. We have proposed how to identify the unification group in the natural GUT by observing the decay modes of nucleon in Ref. [17, 18].

Alternatively, we can test the GUT scenario by measuring sfermion mass spectrum if some signatures of the GUT appear in the sfermion masses. For example, if the rank of the unification group is larger than 4, the non-vanishing D-term contributions which are usually flavor blind can be a signature of the GUT scenario [19]. The MUSM can be a signature of $E_6 \times SU(2)_F$ GUT, since the most serious CEDM constraints for the natural SUSY type mass spectrum can be avoided in the scenario by spontaneous CP violation. One more interesting test for the $E_6 \times SU(2)_F$ GUT scenario is to observe the non-vanishing D-term contributions of the E_6 and $SU(2)_F$ gauge symmetry to sfermion masses. It is interesting because they spoil the universality of the sfermion masses. Before the LHC found the 126 GeV Higgs[20], these D-term contributions are strongly constrained to be small from the various FCNC processes[21]. However, the stop mass must be larger than 1 TeV in

	Ψ_a	Ψ_3	F_a	$\bar{F}^a$	Φ	$\bar{\Phi}$	C	$\bar{C}$	A	Z_3	Θ
E_6	**27**	**27**	**1**	**1**	**27**	$\overline{\mathbf{27}}$	**27**	$\overline{\mathbf{27}}$	**78**	**1**	**1**
$SU(2)_F$	**2**	**1**	**2**	$\bar{\mathbf{2}}$	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**
$U(1)_A$	4	$\frac{3}{2}$	$-\frac{3}{2}$	$-\frac{5}{2}$	-3	1	-4	-1	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{3}{2}$	-1
Z_6	3	3	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0

Table 1: Field contents and charge assignment under $E_6 \times SU(2)_F \times U(1)_A \times Z_6$.

order to realize 126 GeV Higgs, and therefore the other sfermion masses can be O(10 TeV). Since FCNC constraints become much milder when the SUSY breaking scale is O(10 TeV), sizable D-term contribution may be allowed.

In this paper, we clarify the D-term contributions of $E_6 \times SU(2)_F \times U(1)_A$ GUT model and discuss the FCNC constraint mainly from ϵ of $K^0\bar{K}^0$ mixing. We will conclude that sizable D-term contribution is possible. If the D-term contributions are sufficiently large and observed by future experiments, for example, by the SuperLHC, then we can obtain the precious evidence of the GUT scenario.

2 $E_6 \times SU(2)_F \times U(1)_A$ SUSY GUT model

In this section we give a short review on $E_6 \times SU(2)_F \times U(1)_A$ SUSY GUT model. Please refer to [3, 4] for more detail explanation on the model and the notation for the GUT model in this paper is almost the same as these for the model in Ref. [18].

2.1 Yukawa matrices for quarks and charged leptons

Contents of matters and Higgs and their charge assignment are shown in Table 1, though this model is just an example. In the model we introduce three 27 dimensional (fundamental) fields of E_6 as matters. **27** is decomposed in the $E_6 \supset SO(10) \times U(1)_{V'}$ notation (and in the $[SO(10) \supset SU(5) \times U(1)_V]$ notation) as

$$\mathbf{27} = \mathbf{16}_1[\mathbf{10}_1 + \bar{\mathbf{5}}_{-3} + \mathbf{1}_5] + \mathbf{10}_{-2}[\mathbf{5}_{-2} + \bar{\mathbf{5}}'_2] + \mathbf{1}'_4[\mathbf{1}'_0]. \tag{2}$$

27 of E_6 includes not only spinor **16** but also vector **10** of $SO(10)$. These **10**s of $SO(10)$ play an important role in obtaining realistic quark and lepton masses and mixings. Spinor and vector of $SO(10)$ are decomposed in the

$SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ notation as

$$\mathbf{16} \to \underbrace{q_L(\mathbf{3},\mathbf{2})_{\frac{1}{6}} + u^c_R(\bar{\mathbf{3}},\mathbf{1})_{-\frac{2}{3}} + e^c_R(\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1})_1}_{\mathbf{10}} + \underbrace{d^c_R(\bar{\mathbf{3}},\mathbf{1})_{\frac{1}{3}} + l_L(\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2})_{-\frac{1}{2}}}_{\bar{\mathbf{5}}} + \underbrace{\nu^c_R(\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1})_0}_{\mathbf{1}}, \tag{3}$$

$$\mathbf{10} \to \underbrace{D^c_R(\bar{\mathbf{3}},\mathbf{1})_{\frac{1}{3}} + L_L(\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2})_{-\frac{1}{2}}}_{\bar{\mathbf{5}}'} + \underbrace{\overline{D^c_R}(\mathbf{3},\mathbf{1})_{-\frac{1}{3}} + \overline{L_L}(\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2})_{\frac{1}{2}}}_{\mathbf{5}}. \tag{4}$$

Matter fields $\mathbf{27}_i$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ include six $\bar{\mathbf{5}}$s of $SU(5)$. Three of six $\bar{\mathbf{5}}$s become superheavy by developing the VEVs $\langle\Phi\rangle$, which breaks E_6 into $SO(10)$, and $\langle C\rangle$, which breaks $SO(10)$ into $SU(5)$, through the superpotential

$$\begin{aligned} W_Y &= (a\Psi_3\Psi_3 + b\Psi_3\bar{F}^a\Psi_a + c\bar{F}^a\Psi_a\bar{F}^b\Psi_b)\Phi + d(\Psi_a,\Phi,\bar{\Phi},A,Z_3,\Theta) \\ &\quad + f'\bar{F}^a\Psi_a\epsilon^{bc}F_b\Psi_cC + g'\Psi_3\epsilon^{ab}F_a\Psi_bC, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where a, b, c, f' and g' are $O(1)$ coefficients. $d(\Psi_a,\Phi,\bar{\Phi},A,Z_3,\Theta)$ is a gauge invariant function of Ψ_a, Φ, $\bar{\Phi}$, A, Z_3 and Θ, and it contributes to $\Psi_1\Psi_2\Phi$. The other three $\bar{\mathbf{5}}$s become the SM $\bar{\mathbf{5}}^0_i$ whose main components become $(\bar{\mathbf{5}}^0_1, \bar{\mathbf{5}}^0_2, \bar{\mathbf{5}}^0_3) \sim (\bar{\mathbf{5}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{5}}'_1, \bar{\mathbf{5}}_2)$. This is a critical observation in calculating the D-term contribution to the sfermion masses.

After developing VEVs $\langle\bar{\Phi}\Phi\rangle \sim \lambda^2$, $\langle\bar{C}C\rangle \sim \lambda^5$, $\langle A\rangle \sim \lambda^{1/2}$, $\langle\bar{F}\rangle \sim (0, \lambda^2)$ and $\langle F\rangle \sim (0, e^{i\rho}\lambda^2)$, we can obtain the up-type Yukawa matrix Y_u, down-type Yukawa matrix Y_d, and charged lepton Yukawa matrix Y_e at the GUT scale as

$$Y_u = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{3}d_q\lambda^5 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{3}d_q\lambda^5 & c\lambda^4 & b\lambda^2 \\ 0 & b\lambda^2 & a \end{pmatrix}, \tag{6}$$

$$Y_d = \begin{pmatrix} -\left(\frac{(bg-af)^2}{ac-b^2}+g^2\right)\frac{\beta_H}{a}e^{i(2\rho-\delta)}\lambda^6 & -\frac{bg-af}{ac-b^2}\frac{2}{3}d_5\beta_He^{i(\rho-\delta)}\lambda^{5.5} & \frac{1}{3}d_q\lambda^5 \\ \left(-\frac{d_q}{3}-\frac{bg-af}{ac-b^2}\frac{b\frac{2}{3}d_5}{g}\right)\lambda^5 & \left(f\beta_He^{i(\rho-\delta)}-\frac{(\frac{2}{3}d_5)^2}{ac-b^2}\frac{ab}{g}e^{-i\rho}\right)\lambda^{4.5} & \frac{cg-bf}{g}\lambda^4 \\ -\frac{bg-af}{ac-b^2}\frac{a\frac{2}{3}d_5}{g}\lambda^3 & \left(g\beta_He^{i(\rho-\delta)}-\frac{(\frac{2}{3}d_5)^2}{ac-b^2}\frac{a^2}{g}e^{-i\rho}\right)\lambda^{2.5} & \frac{bg-af}{g}\lambda^2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{7}$$

$$Y_e = \begin{pmatrix} -\left(\frac{(bg-af)^2}{ac-b^2}+g^2\right)\frac{\beta_H}{a}e^{i(2\rho-\delta)}\lambda^6 & d_l\lambda^5 & 0 \\ 0 & f\beta_He^{i(\rho-\delta)}\lambda^{4.5} & g\beta_He^{i(\rho-\delta)}\lambda^{2.5} \\ -d_l\lambda^5 & \frac{cg-bf}{g}\lambda^4 & \frac{bg-af}{g}\lambda^2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{8}$$

where $a, b, c, d_q, d_5, d_l, f, g$ and β_H are real $O(1)$ coefficients, ρ and δ are $O(1)$ phases, and $\lambda \sim 0.22$ is taken to be Cabibbo angle. In this paper, we begin our arguments from these Yukawa matrices which have only 9 real parameters and 2 CP phases.

2.2 Mass spectrum of sfermions

The sfermion masses can be obtained from the SUSY breaking potential

$$\begin{aligned} V_{SB} &= m_0^2|\Psi_a|^2 + m_3^2|\Psi_3|^2 + m_{11}^2|\epsilon^{ab}\Psi_a F_b|^2 + m_{22}^2|\Psi_a \bar{F}^a|^2 \\ &+(m_{23}^2\Psi_3^\dagger\Psi_a\bar{F}^a + m_{13}^2\lambda^5\Psi_3^\dagger\epsilon^{ab}\Psi_a\bar{F}_b^\dagger + m_{12}^2\lambda^5(\Psi_a\bar{F}^a)^\dagger\epsilon^{bc}\Psi_b\bar{F}_c^\dagger + h.c.) \quad (9) \\ &+m^2(\Phi^\dagger\Psi^{a\dagger}\Psi_a\Phi) + (m_{12}'^2\lambda^2\bar{C}|\Psi_a|^2\bar{\Phi}^\dagger + m_{23}'^2\lambda^2\bar{C}\Psi_3^\dagger\Psi_a\bar{F}^a\bar{\Phi}^\dagger + h.c.), \end{aligned}$$

where the terms in the last line give the mass terms which do not respect E_6 symmetry because the VEVs $\langle\Phi\rangle$ and $\langle C\rangle$ break E_6 symmetry. The D-term contributions are written as

$$\Delta\tilde{m}_\psi^2 = \sum_I Q_I(\psi)D_I, \quad (10)$$

where D_I is the squared gauge coupling times the D-term of $U(1)_{V'}(I=6)$, $U(1)_V(I=10)$, $U(1)_F(I=F)$ and $U(1)_A(I=A)$, and $Q_I(\psi)$ is the $U(1)$ charge of the field ψ. Here $U(1)_F$ is the Cartan part of $SU(2)_F$. As a result, sparticle masses for $\bar{\mathbf{5}}$, $\bar{\mathbf{5}}'$ and $\mathbf{10}$ of $SU(5)$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{m}_{\bar{5}}^2 &= \begin{pmatrix} m_0^2+\lambda^4 m_{11}^2 & \lambda^9 m_{12}^2 & \lambda^7 m_{13}^2 \\ \lambda^9 m_{12}^2 & m_0^2+\lambda^4 m_{22}^2 & \lambda^2 m_{23}^2 \\ \lambda^7 m_{13}^2 & \lambda^2 m_{23}^2 & m_3^2 \end{pmatrix} + D_6 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \\ & 1 & \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &+D_{10}\begin{pmatrix} -3 & & \\ & -3 & \\ & & -3 \end{pmatrix} + D_F \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \\ & -1 & \\ & & 0 \end{pmatrix} + D_A \begin{pmatrix} 4 & & \\ & 4 & \\ & & \frac{3}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (11) \\ \tilde{m}_{\bar{5}'}^2 &= \begin{pmatrix} m_0^2+\lambda^2 m^2+\lambda^4 m_{11}^2 & \lambda^9 m_{12}^2 & \lambda^7 m_{13}^2 \\ \lambda^9 m_{12}^2 & m_0^2+\lambda^2 m^2+\lambda^4 m_{22}^2 & \lambda^2 m_{23}^2 \\ \lambda^7 m_{13}^2 & \lambda^2 m_{23}^2 & m_3^2 \end{pmatrix} \\ &+D_6\begin{pmatrix} -2 & & \\ & -2 & \\ & & -2 \end{pmatrix} + D_{10}\begin{pmatrix} 2 & & \\ & 2 & \\ & & 2 \end{pmatrix} + D_F \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \\ & -1 & \\ & & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (12) \\ &+D_A \begin{pmatrix} 4 & & \\ & 4 & \\ & & \frac{3}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \tilde{m}_{10}^2 &= \begin{pmatrix} m_0^2+\lambda^4 m_{11}^2 & \lambda^9 m_{12}^2 & \lambda^7 m_{13}^2 \\ \lambda^9 m_{12}^2 & m_0^2+\lambda^4 m_{22}^2 & \lambda^2 m_{23}^2 \\ \lambda^7 m_{13}^2 & \lambda^2 m_{23}^2 & m_3^2 \end{pmatrix} + D_6 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \\ & 1 & \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &+D_{10}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \\ & 1 & \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix} + D_F \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \\ & -1 & \\ & & 0 \end{pmatrix} + D_A \begin{pmatrix} 4 & & \\ & 4 & \\ & & \frac{3}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (13) \end{aligned}$$

where the contribution of the term $m^2\Phi^\dagger\Psi^{a\dagger}\Psi_a\Phi$ to $|\mathbf{16}_{\Psi_a}|^2$ is included in m_0^2 by redefinition of m_0^2. Then, the sfermion mass matrix for SM $\bar{\mathbf{5}}$ fields, which are represented as $(\bar{\mathbf{5}}_1^0, \bar{\mathbf{5}}_2^0, \bar{\mathbf{5}}_3^0) \sim (\bar{\mathbf{5}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{5}}_1', \bar{\mathbf{5}}_2)$, becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{m}^2_{\bar{5}^0} \sim & \begin{pmatrix} m_0^2+\lambda^4 m_{11}^2 & \lambda^{5.5} m_{12}'^2 & \lambda^9 m_{12}^2 \\ \lambda^{5.5} m_{12}'^2 & m_0^2+\lambda^2 m^2+\lambda^4 m_{11}^2 & \lambda^{7.5} m_{23}'^2 \\ \lambda^9 m_{12}^2 & \lambda^{7.5} m_{23}'^2 & m_0^2+\lambda^4 m_{22}^2 \end{pmatrix} \\ & + D_6 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \\ & -2 & \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix} + D_{10} \begin{pmatrix} -3 & & \\ & 2 & \\ & & -3 \end{pmatrix} \\ & + D_F \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \\ & 1 & \\ & & -1 \end{pmatrix} + D_A \begin{pmatrix} 4 & & \\ & 4 & \\ & & 4 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Moreover, the contributions from the sub-leading components of $\bar{\mathbf{5}}_i^0$ become

$$\Delta\tilde{m}^2_{\bar{5}^0} \sim (m_0^2 - m_3^2) \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^6 & \lambda^{5.5} & \lambda^5 \\ \lambda^{5.5} & \lambda^5 & \lambda^{4.5} \\ \lambda^5 & \lambda^{4.5} & \lambda^4 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{15}$$

These sfermion mass matrices give interesting predictions of $E_6 \times SU(2)_F \times U(1)_A$ GUT, though the terms which are suppressed by power of λ are strongly dependent on the explicit model. In the next section, we discuss how to obtain the GUT information from sfermion mass spectrum.

3 Signatures of $E_6 \times SU(2)_F \times U(1)_A$ GUT from sfermion mass spectrum

Suppose that all sfermion masses are measured by experiments in future. In this section, we discuss the signatures of the GUT in sfermion mass spectrum at the GUT scale. We have to use renormalization groups (RGs) to obtain the sfermion mass spectrum at the weak scale, but we do not discuss the effects in this section. The constraints from the FCNC processes will be discussed in the next section.

If the observed sfermion mass spectrum is the MUSM as

$$\tilde{m}^2_{10} \sim \begin{pmatrix} m_0^2 & & \\ & m_0^2 & \\ & & m_3^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{m}^2_{\bar{5}^0} \sim \begin{pmatrix} m_0^2 & & \\ & m_0^2 & \\ & & m_0^2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{16}$$

$E_6 \times SU(2)_F$ GUT is strongly implied. Of course, the MUSM is nothing but a natural SUSY type sfermion mass spectrum, which are predicted by a lot

of models. However, generically natural SUSY type sfermion mass spectrum is suffering from the CEDM problem[14], and there are few models in which the problem can be solved in a natural way. We would like to emphasize that the CEDM problem can be solved in the $E_6 \times SU(2)_F \times U(1)_A$ GUT by spontaneous CP violation in a non-trivial way[15].

In order to obtain more specific signatures of the $E_6 \times SU(2)_F \times U(1)_A$ GUT, we study the D-term contributions. For a while, we neglect the terms which are suppressed by power of λ. We will discuss these terms later. Then, the mass matrices of $\tilde{m}^2_{10}$ and $\tilde{m}^2_{\bar{5}^0}$ are rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{m}^2_{10} &= (m_0^2 + D_6 + D_{10} + D_F + 4D_A)\mathbf{1}_{3\times 3} \\
&+ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & \\ & -2D_F & \\ & & -D_F - \frac{5}{2}D_A + m_3^2 - m_0^2 \end{pmatrix} \\
&\equiv m^2_{10,0}\mathbf{1}_{3\times 3} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & \\ & \Delta m^2_{10,2} & \\ & & \Delta m^2_{10,3} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (17) \\
\tilde{m}^2_{\bar{5}^0} &= (m_0^2 + D_6 - 3D_{10} + D_F + 4D_A)\mathbf{1}_{3\times 3} \\
&+ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & \\ & -3D_6 + 5D_{10} & \\ & & -2D_F \end{pmatrix} \\
&\equiv m^2_{\bar{5}^0,0}\mathbf{1}_{3\times 3} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & \\ & \Delta m^2_{\bar{5},2} & \\ & & \Delta m^2_{\bar{5},3} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (18)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{3\times 3}$ is a 3×3 unit matrix. A non-trivial prediction of this model is $\Delta m^2_{10,2} = \Delta m^2_{\bar{5},3}$. If this relation is observed, we obtain a strong evidence for this model and can know the D_F. The D_6 and D_{10} can be determined if $m^2_{10,0} - m^2_{\bar{5}^0,0}$ and $\Delta m^2_{\bar{5},2}$ are observed. If these small modifications from the MUSM and $\Delta m^2_{10,2} = \Delta m^2_{\bar{5},3}$ are observed, we think that the $E_6 \times SU(2)_F \times U(1)_A$ model can be established.

How large D-terms are allowed? If these D-terms are very small, it may become difficult to measure them, and if these D-terms are large, the FCNC constraints cannot be satisfied. In the next section, we study the constraints to the D-terms from the FCNC processes, especially from ϵ parameter in $K^0\bar{K}^0$ mixing, which gives the strongest constraints.

4 FCNC constraints to D-terms

In this section, we focus on the natural SUSY type sfermion masses, i.e., $m_0 \gg m_3$, because the FCNC constraints become milder and the sizable D-term may be allowed. Therefore, we fix $\Delta m^2_{10,3} = m_0^2$. To obtain 126 GeV Higgs, m_3 must be larger than 1 TeV. Since the smaller m_3 leads to be more natural, we take $m_3 \sim O(1\text{TeV})$. In the literature, the upper bound for the ratio m_0/m_3 has been studied, which is derived from the requirement of the positivity of stop mass square to be roughly 5 through two loop RG contribution[8]. Therefore, we expect that m_0 is $O(10\text{TeV})$. And we consider the constraints from the CP violating parameter ϵ in $K^0\bar{K}^0$ mixing because they are the most strong constraints in this situation. In this paper, we do not argue the upper bound of m_0/m_3 explicitly, because larger stop mass can always satisfy the positivity and the upper bound is dependent on the explicit models between the GUT scale and the SUSY breaking scale.

Since we calculate constraints from the FCNC processes with the mass eigenstates of quarks and leptons, we need diagonalizing matrices which make Yukawa matrices diagonal as

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{Li}(Y_\psi)_{ij}\psi^c_{Rj} &= (L^\dagger_\psi \psi_L)_i (L^T_\psi Y_\psi R_\psi)_{ij} (R^\dagger_\psi \psi^c_R)_j \\ &\equiv \psi'_{Li}(Y^D_\psi)_{ij}\psi'^c_{Rj}, \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where ψ is a flavor eigenstate, ψ' is a mass eigenstate and Y^D_ψ is a diagonalized matrix of ψ. We summarize the detail expression of these diagonalizing matrices with the explicit $O(1)$ coefficients in Appendix A. Here we roughly show the diagonalizing matrices for up-type quark, down-type quark and charged lepton without $O(1)$ coefficients as

$$L_u \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{3}\lambda & 0 \\ \frac{1}{3}\lambda & 1 & \lambda^2 \\ \frac{1}{3}\lambda^3 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, R_u \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{3}\lambda & 0 \\ \frac{1}{3}\lambda & 1 & \lambda^2 \\ \frac{1}{3}\lambda^3 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{20}$$

$$L_d \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & (\frac{2}{3}+i\frac{4}{27})\lambda & \frac{1}{3}\lambda^3 \\ (\frac{2}{3}+i\frac{4}{27})\lambda & 1 & \lambda^2 \\ (\frac{2}{3}+i\frac{4}{27})\lambda^3 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, R_d \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{2}{3}(1+i)\lambda^{0.5} & \frac{2}{3}\lambda \\ \frac{2}{3}(1+i)\lambda^{0.5} & 1 & (1+i)\lambda^{0.5} \\ \frac{2}{3}(1+i)\lambda & (1+i)\lambda^{0.5} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{21}$$

$$L_e \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & (1+i)\lambda^{0.5} & 0 \\ (1+i)\lambda^{0.5} & 1 & (1+i)\lambda^{0.5} \\ \lambda & (1+i)\lambda^{0.5} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, R_e \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda & \lambda^3 \\ \lambda & 1 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^3 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{22}$$

$$L_\nu \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & (1+i)\lambda^{0.5} & (1+i)\lambda \\ (1+i)\lambda^{0.5} & 1 & (1+i)\lambda^{0.5} \\ (1+i)\lambda & (1+i)\lambda^{0.5} & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{23}$$

We have two types for the diagonalizing matrix U as

$$U = \begin{cases} U_{\text{CKM-type}} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a_{12}\lambda & a_{13}\lambda^3 \\ a_{21}\lambda & 1 & a_{23}\lambda^2 \\ a_{31}\lambda^3 & a_{32}\lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & (\text{for } \mathbf{10} \text{ of } SU(5) \text{ multiplet}) \\ U_{\text{MNS-type}} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12}\lambda^{0.5} & b_{13}\lambda \\ b_{21}\lambda^{0.5} & b_{22} & b_{23}\lambda^{0.5} \\ b_{31}\lambda & b_{32}\lambda^{0.5} & b_{33} \end{pmatrix} & (\text{for } \bar{\mathbf{5}} \text{ of } SU(5) \text{ multiplet}) \end{cases}, \tag{24}$$

where a_{ij} and b_{ij} are complex $O(1)$ coefficients. The mass insertion parameters defined as

$$(\delta^\psi_{ij})_{\Gamma\Gamma} \equiv \frac{(U^\dagger_{\psi_\Gamma} \tilde{m}^2_{\psi_\Gamma} U_{\psi_\Gamma})_{ij}}{m^2_{\tilde{\psi}}}, \quad (\Gamma = L, R) \tag{25}$$

can be calculated as

$$(\delta^\psi_{ij})_{\Gamma\Gamma} = \tag{26}$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} \cdots & a^*_{21}\lambda\Delta m^2_{10,2} + a^*_{31}a_{32}\lambda^5\Delta m^2_{10,3} & (a^*_{21}a_{23}\Delta m^2_{10\ 2} + a^*_{31}\Delta m^2_{10,3})\lambda^3 \\ \cdots & \cdots & (a_{23}\Delta m^2_{10,2} + a^*_{32}\Delta m^2_{10,3})\lambda^2 \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \end{pmatrix} /m^2_{\tilde{\psi}},$$

$$(\delta^\psi_{ij})_{\Gamma\Gamma} = \tag{27}$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} \cdots & b^*_{21}b_{22}\lambda^{0.5}\Delta m^2_{\bar{5},2} + b^*_{31}b_{32}\lambda^{1.5}\Delta m^2_{\bar{5},3} & (b^*_{21}b_{23}\Delta m^2_{\bar{5},2} + b^*_{31}b_{33}\Delta m^2_{\bar{5},3})\lambda \\ \cdots & \cdots & (b^*_{22}b_{23}\Delta m^2_{\bar{5},2} + b^*_{32}b_{33}\Delta m^2_{\bar{5},3})\lambda^{0.5} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \end{pmatrix} /m^2_{\tilde{\psi}},$$

for **10** fields and $\bar{\mathbf{5}}$ fields, respectively. In Appendix B, we show each mass insertion in this model with explicit $O(1)$ coefficients.

Let us calculate the constraints from the ϵ parameter in $K^0\bar{K}^0$ mixing. We use the constraints for $(\delta^d_{12})_{LL}$ and $(\delta^d_{12})_{RR}$ as

$$\sqrt{|\text{Im}(\delta^d_{12})^2_{LL}|} \quad < 2.9 \times 10^{-3} \left(\frac{m_{\tilde{d}}}{500\text{GeV}}\right), \tag{28}$$

$$\sqrt{|\text{Im}(\delta^d_{12})^2_{RR}|} \quad < 2.9 \times 10^{-3} \left(\frac{m_{\tilde{d}}}{500\text{GeV}}\right), \tag{29}$$

$$\sqrt{|\text{Im}(\delta^d_{12})_{LL}(\delta^d_{12})_{RR}|} \quad < 1.1 \times 10^{-4} \left(\frac{m_{\tilde{d}}}{500\text{GeV}}\right), \tag{30}$$

which are obtained by requiring that the SUSY contribution ϵ_{SUSY} is smaller ϵ_{SM}[22]. These parameters can roughly be calculated as

$$(\delta^d_{12})_{LL} \sim \left(\frac{2}{3} + i\frac{4}{27}\right)\left(\lambda\frac{\Delta m^2_{10,2}}{m^2_{\tilde{d}}} + \lambda^5\frac{\Delta m^2_{10,3}}{m^2_{\tilde{d}}}\right) \tag{31}$$

$$(\delta^d_{12})_{RR} \sim \frac{2}{3}(1+i)\left(\lambda^{0.5}\frac{\Delta m^2_{\bar{5},2}}{m^2_{\tilde{d}}} + \lambda^{1.5}\frac{\Delta m^2_{\bar{5},3}}{m^2_{\tilde{d}}}\right). \tag{32}$$

By taking $\Delta m^2_{10,3} = m^2_0 = m^2_{\tilde{d}}$, we can obtain the allowed region in ($\Delta m_{\bar{5},2}$, $\Delta m_{\bar{1}0,2} = \Delta m_{\bar{5},3}$) space, which is shown in Fig. 1. Note that $\Delta m_{10,2} = \Delta m_{\bar{5},3}$ is one of the predictions in $E_6 \times SU(2)_F \times U(1)_A$ model. Roughly, if m_0 is $O(10\text{TeV})$, Δm is allowed to be $O(1\text{TeV})$ which is nothing but the scale of m_3. Interestingly, the constraint to $\Delta m_{\bar{5},2}$ is milder, and sizable $\Delta m_{\bar{5},2}$ can be allowed. Since the E-twisting structure $(\bar{\mathbf{5}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{5}}'_1, \bar{\mathbf{5}}_2)$ is important to obtain the non-vanishing $\Delta m_{\bar{5},2}$, this can be a critical signature of $E_6 \times SU(2)_F \times U(1)_A$ model. On the other hand, the constraint to $\Delta m_{10,2} = \Delta m_{\bar{5},3}$ is stronger, because this contributes to $(\delta^d_{12})_{LL}$ and $(\delta^d_{12})_{RR}$ at the same time.

In the above arguments, we neglected the contributions to the sfermion masses which are suppressed by power of λ in Eqs. (13) and (14). All these terms except $\lambda^2 m^2$ term in Eq. (14) can be neglected in the above arguments. However, $\lambda^2 m^2$ term gives non-vanishing $\Delta m_{\bar{5},2}/m_{\tilde{d}}$, which becomes $O(\lambda)$ if $m \sim m_0$. The FCNC constraints in this situation can be easily extracted from Fig. 1.

5 Discussions and summary

We have shown that the sizable D-term contributions to sfermion mass spectrum can be signatures of certain GUT, $E_6 \times SU(2)_F \times U(1)_A$ GUT. Note that these D-term contributions deviate the degenerate sfermion masses among different generations in this model. This point is one large difference between our work and the previous works which have argued the D-term contributions[19], which deviate masses only between sfermions with different quantum charges, as a signature of GUT with larger rank unification group. Such D-terms are strongly constrained by the FCNC processes if the SUSY breaking scale is the weak scale. However, in $E_6 \times SU(2)_F \times U(1)_A$, natural SUSY type sfermion mass spectrum is obtained, and if the masses of $\mathbf{10}_3$ sfermions are larger than $O(1\text{TeV})$ to realize 126 GeV Higgs and the other sfermion masses are $O(10\text{TeV})$, then sizable D-term contribution is allowed. A novel relation $\tilde{m}^2_{\bar{\mathbf{5}}_3} - \tilde{m}^2_{\bar{\mathbf{5}}_1} = \tilde{m}^2_{\mathbf{10}_2} - \tilde{m}^2_{\mathbf{10}_1}$ is predicted. If the deviations

by these D-terms can be observed in future experiments like 100 TeV proton collider or muon collider, we may confirm the $E_6 \times SU(2)_F \times U(1)_A$ GUT.

Of course, we have to consider the renormalization group (RG) effects in the estimation generically, though we have not considered this effect in this paper. However, if the gravitino mass is $O(100\text{TeV})$ to solve the gravitino problem and SUSY breaking parameters in the MSSM are $O(1\text{TeV})$ to solve the hierarchy problem, the mirage scale, at which anomaly mediation contribution can cancel the RG effect, can be the SUSY breaking scale. As a result, we can observe the GUT signature through the gravity mediation contribution directly at the SUSY breaking scale[23].

Since the GUT scale is much larger than the TeV scale which we can reach by experiments, it is important to consider how to test the GUT scenario. We have discussed the D-term contributions which are dependent on generations, and they can be a promising signatures of $E_6 \times SU(2)_F \times U(1)_A$ GUT scenario.

6 Acknowledgement

N.M. is supported in part by Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research from MEXT of Japan. This work is partially supported by the Grand-in-Aid for Nagoya University Leadership Development Program for Space Exploration and Research Program from the MEXT of Japan.

A The coefficients of diagonalizing matrices (in leading order)

In Appendix A in Ref. [18], we show how to diagonalize the 3×3 matrix Y_{ij}. Here we show the diagonalizing matrices for up-type quark, down-type quark and charged lepton. The diagonalizing matrices L_ψ and R_ψ come from mixing angles $s_{ij}^{\psi L/R} \equiv \sin\theta_{ij}^{\psi L/R} e^{i\chi_{ij}^{\psi L/R}}$ and $c_{ij}^{\psi L/R} \equiv \cos\theta_{ij}^{\psi L/R}$. In our calculation we use the approximation that the mixing angles are small, i.e., $|s_{ij}^{\psi L/R}| \sim |\theta_{ij}^{\psi L/R}| \ll 1$ ($s_{ij}^{\psi L/R} \sim \theta_{ij}^{\psi L/R} e^{i\chi_{ij}^{\psi L/R}}$) and $c_{ij}^{\psi L/R} \simeq 1$. In this approximation the diagonalizing matrices are

$$L_\psi \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & s_{12}^{\psi L*} & s_{13}^{\psi L*} \\ -s_{12}^{\psi L} & 1 & s_{23}^{\psi L*} \\ -s_{13}^{\psi L} + s_{23}^{\psi L} s_{12}^{\psi L} & -s_{23}^{\psi L} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{33}$$

$$R_\psi \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & s_{12}^{\psi R} & s_{13}^{\psi R} \\ -s_{12}^{\psi R*} & 1 & s_{23}^{\psi R} \\ -s_{13}^{\psi R*} + s_{23}^{\psi R*} s_{12}^{\psi R*} & -s_{23}^{\psi R*} & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{34}$$

From Eq. (6), the mixing angles for up-type quark are calculated as

$$s_{23}^{uL} = s_{23}^{uR*} \simeq \frac{b}{a}\lambda^2 \equiv R_{23}^{uL}\lambda^2,\ s_{13}^{uL} = s_{13}^{uR*} \simeq 0,\ s_{12}^{uL} = -s_{12}^{uR*} \simeq \frac{\frac{1}{3}ad_q}{ac-b^2}\lambda \equiv \frac{1}{3}R_{12}^{uL}\lambda. \tag{35}$$

From Eq. (7), the mixing angles for down-type quark are calculated as

$$s_{23}^{dL} \simeq \frac{cg-bf}{bg-af}\lambda^2 \equiv R_{23}^{dL}\lambda^2, s_{13}^{dL} \simeq \frac{1}{3}\frac{d_q g}{bg-af}\lambda^3 \equiv \frac{1}{3}R_{13}^{dL}\lambda^3, \tag{36}$$

$$\begin{aligned} s_{12}^{dL} &\simeq -\frac{2}{3}\frac{(bg-af)^2 d_5}{(ac-b^2)\{f(bg-af)-g(cg-bf)\}}\lambda \\ &\quad + \frac{4}{27}\frac{a^2 d_q d_5^2}{(ac-b^2)\{f(bg-af)-g(cg-bf)\}\beta_H}e^{-i(2\rho-\delta)}\lambda \\ &\equiv (\frac{2}{3}R_{12}^{dL} + \frac{4}{27}I_{12}^{dL}e^{-i(2\rho-\delta)})\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} s_{23}^{dR*} &\simeq \frac{g^2\beta_H}{bg-af}e^{i(\rho-\delta)}\lambda^{0.5} - \frac{4}{9}\frac{d_5^2 a^2}{(ac-b^2)(bg-af)}e^{-i\rho}\lambda^{0.5} \\ &\equiv I_{23}^{dR}e^{i(\rho-\delta)}\lambda^{0.5} - \frac{4}{9}I_{23}^{\prime dR}e^{-i\rho}\lambda^{0.5},\ s_{13}^{dR*} \simeq -\frac{2}{3}\frac{ad_5}{ac-b^2}\lambda \equiv \frac{2}{3}R_{13}^{dR}\lambda, \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

$$s_{12}^{dR*} \simeq \frac{2}{3}\frac{d_5(bg-af)}{\{f(bg-af)-g(cg-bf)\}\beta_H}e^{-i(\rho-\delta)}\lambda^{0.5} \equiv \frac{2}{3}I_{12}^{dR}e^{-i(\rho-\delta)}\lambda^{0.5}.$$

From Eq. (8), the mixing angles for charged lepton are calculated as

$$s_{23}^{eL} \simeq \frac{g^2\beta_H}{bg-af}e^{i(\rho-\delta)}\lambda^{0.5} \equiv I_{23}^{dR}e^{i(\rho-\delta)}\lambda^{0.5},\ s_{13}^{eL} \simeq 0, \tag{38}$$

$$\begin{aligned} s_{12}^{eL} &\simeq \frac{d_l(bg-af)}{\beta_H\{f(bg-af)-g(cg-bf)\}}e^{-i(\rho-\delta)}\lambda^{0.5} \equiv I_{12}^{eL}e^{-i(\rho-\delta)}\lambda^{0.5} \\ s_{23}^{eR*} &\simeq s_{23}^{dL} \equiv R_{23}^{dL}\lambda^2,\ s_{13}^{eR*} \simeq -\frac{d_l g}{bg-af}\lambda^3 \equiv R_{13}^{eR}\lambda^3, \\ s_{12}^{eR*} &\simeq \frac{d_l g^2}{\{f(bg-af)-g(cg-bf)\}}\lambda \equiv R_{12}^{eR}\lambda. \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

The diagonalizing matrices for up-type quark, down-type quark and charged lepton are calculated as

$$L_u \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{3}R_{12}^{uL}\lambda & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{3}R_{12}^{uL}\lambda & 1 & R_{23}^{uL}\lambda^2 \\ \frac{1}{3}R_{23}^{uL}R_{12}^{uL}\lambda^3 & -R_{23}^{uL}\lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{40}$$

$$R_u \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\frac{1}{3}R_{12}^{uL}\lambda & 0 \\ \frac{1}{3}R_{12}^{uL}\lambda & 1 & R_{23}^{uL}\lambda^2 \\ -\frac{1}{3}R_{23}^{uL}R_{12}^{uL}\lambda^3 & -R_{23}^{uL}\lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{41}$$

$$L_d = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \\ -(\frac{2}{3}R_{12}^{dL} + \frac{4}{27}I_{12}^{dL}e^{-i(2\rho-\delta)})\lambda & & \\ (-\frac{1}{3}R_{13}^{dL} + \frac{2}{3}R_{23}^{dL}R_{12}^{dL} + \frac{4}{27}R_{23}^{dL}I_{12}^{dL}e^{-i(2\rho-\delta)})\lambda^3 & & \\ & (\frac{2}{3}R_{12}^{dL} + \frac{4}{27}I_{12}^{dL}e^{i(2\rho-\delta)})\lambda & \frac{1}{3}R_{13}^{dL}\lambda^3 \\ & 1 & R_{23}^{dL}\lambda^2 \\ & -R_{23}^{dL}\lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{42}$$

$$R_d = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \frac{2}{3}I_{12}^{dR}e^{i(\rho-\delta)}\lambda^{0.5} \\ -\frac{2}{3}I_{12}^{dR}e^{-i(\rho-\delta)}\lambda^{0.5} & & 1 \\ (-\frac{2}{3}R_{13}^{dR} + \frac{2}{3}I_{23}^{dR}I_{12}^{dR} - \frac{8}{27}I_{23}^{\prime dR}I_{12}^{dR}e^{-i(2\rho-\delta)})\lambda & & -I_{23}^{dR}e^{i(\rho-\delta)}\lambda^{0.5} \\ & \frac{2}{3}R_{13}^{dR}\lambda & \\ & I_{23}^{dR}e^{-i(\rho-\delta)}\lambda^{0.5} & \\ & 1 & \end{pmatrix}, \tag{43}$$

$$L_e \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & I_{12}^{eL}e^{i(\rho-\delta)}\lambda^{0.5} & 0 \\ -I_{12}^{eL}e^{-i(\rho-\delta)}\lambda^{0.5} & 1 & I_{23}^{dR}e^{-i(\rho-\delta)}\lambda^{0.5} \\ I_{23}^{dR}I_{12}^{eL}\lambda & -I_{23}^{dR}e^{i(\rho-\delta)}\lambda^{0.5} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{44}$$

$$R_e \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & R_{12}^{eR}\lambda & R_{13}^{eR}\lambda^3 \\ -R_{12}^{eR}\lambda & 1 & R_{23}^{dL}\lambda^2 \\ (-R_{13}^{eR} + R_{23}^{dL}R_{12}^{eR})\lambda^3 & -R_{23}^{dL}\lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{45}$$

In this model the Majorana neutrino mass matrix has a lot of other real parameters and CP phases, and therefore, we cannot constrain the diagonalizing matrix for neutrino. The diagonalizing matrix for neutrino is written as

$$L_\nu \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda^{0.5} & \lambda \\ \lambda^{0.5} & 1 & \lambda^{0.5} \\ \lambda & \lambda^{0.5} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{46}$$

where we have omitted the complex $O(1)$ coefficients. In this model we can obtain realistic CKM and MNS matrices as

$$U_{CKM} = L_u^\dagger L_d \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & (\frac{1}{3}R_{12}^{uL} - \frac{2}{3}R_{12}^{dL} - \frac{4}{27}I_{12}^{dL}e^{-i(2\rho-\delta)})\lambda & \{-\frac{2}{3}R_{23}^{uL}R_{12}^{dL} - \frac{1}{3}R_{13}^{dL} + \frac{2}{3}I_{23}^{dL}I_{12}^{dL} - \frac{4}{27}(R_{23}^{uL} - R_{23}^{dL})I_{12}^{dL}e^{-i(2\rho-\delta)}\}\lambda^3 \\ (-\frac{1}{3}R_{12}^{uL} + \frac{2}{3}R_{12}^{dL} + \frac{4}{27}I_{12}^{dL}e^{i(\rho-\delta)})\lambda & O(\lambda^4) & \\ 1 & (-R_{23}^{uL} + R_{23}^{dL})\lambda^2 & \\ (R_{23}^{uL} - R_{23}^{dL})\lambda^2 & 1 & \end{pmatrix}, \quad (47)$$

$$|U_{MNS}| = \left|L_\nu^\dagger L_e\right| \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda^{0.5} & \lambda \\ \lambda^{0.5} & 1 & \lambda^{0.5} \\ \lambda & \lambda^{0.5} & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (48)$$

As discussed in Ref. [15, 16], the leading contribution to the component $(U_{CKM})_{13}$ is cancelled and the subleading contribution $O(\lambda^4)$ dominates $(U_{CKM})_{13}$.

B Mass insertions

In this appendix, we just show all mass insertion parameters in this model.

$$(\delta_{12}^u)_{LL} = -(\delta_{12}^u)_{RR} \simeq \left\{-\frac{1}{3}R_{12}^{uL}\lambda\Delta m_{10,2}^2 - \frac{1}{3}(R_{23}^{uL})^2 R_{12}^{uL}\lambda^5\Delta m_{10,3}^2\right\}/m_{\tilde{u}}^2 \quad (49)$$

$$(\delta_{13}^u)_{LL} = -(\delta_{13}^u)_{RR} \simeq \left\{-\frac{1}{3}R_{23}^{uL}R_{12}^{uL}\Delta m_{10,2}^2 + \frac{1}{3}R_{23}^{uL}R_{12}^{uL}\Delta m_{10,3}^2\right\}\lambda^3/m_{\tilde{u}}^2 \quad (50)$$

$$(\delta_{23}^u)_{LL} = (\delta_{23}^u)_{RR} \simeq R_{23}^{uL}\{\Delta m_{10,2}^2 - \Delta m_{10,3}^2\}\lambda^2/m_{\tilde{u}}^2 \quad (51)$$

$$(\delta_{12}^d)_{LL} \simeq \left\{-\left(\frac{2}{3}R_{12}^{dL} + \frac{4}{27}I_{12}^{dL}e^{i(2\rho-\delta)}\right)\lambda\Delta m_{10,2}^2 \right. \quad (52)$$
$$\left. -R_{23}^{dL}\left(-\frac{1}{3}R_{13}^{dL} + \frac{2}{3}R_{23}^{dL}R_{12}^{dL} + \frac{4}{27}R_{23}^{dL}I_{12}^{dL}e^{i(2\rho-\delta)}\right)\lambda^5\Delta m_{10,3}^2\right\}/m_{\tilde{d}}^2$$

$$(\delta_{13}^d)_{LL} \simeq \left\{-R_{23}^{dL}\left(\frac{2}{3}R_{12}^{dL} + \frac{4}{27}I_{12}^{dL}e^{i(2\rho-\delta)}\right)\Delta m_{10,2}^2 \right. \quad (53)$$
$$\left. +\left(-\frac{1}{3}R_{13}^{dL} + \frac{2}{3}R_{23}^{dL}R_{12}^{dL} + \frac{4}{27}R_{23}^{dL}I_{12}^{dL}e^{i(2\rho-\delta)}\right)\Delta m_{10,3}^2\right\}\lambda^3/m_{\tilde{d}}^2$$

$$(\delta_{23}^d)_{LL} \simeq R_{23}^{dL}\{\Delta m_{10,2}^2 - \Delta m_{10,3}^2\}\lambda^2/m_{\tilde{d}}^2 \quad (54)$$

$$(\delta^d_{12})_{RR} \simeq \left\{ -\frac{2}{3} I^{dR}_{12} e^{i(\rho-\delta)} \lambda^{0.5} \Delta m^2_{\bar{5},2} - I^{dR}_{23} \left(-\frac{2}{3} R^{dR}_{13} + \frac{2}{3} I^{dR}_{23} I^{dR}_{12} \right) e^{i(\rho-\delta)} \lambda^{1.5} \Delta m^2_{\bar{5},3} \right\} / m^2_{\tilde{d}} \tag{55}$$

$$(\delta^d_{13})_{RR} \simeq \left\{ \left(-\frac{2}{3} I^{dR}_{23} I^{dR}_{12} + \frac{8}{27} I^{dR}_{12} I'^{dR}_{23} e^{i(2\rho-\delta)} \right) \Delta m^2_{\bar{5},2} \right. \tag{56}$$
$$\left. + \left(-\frac{2}{3} R^{dR}_{13} + \frac{2}{3} I^{dR}_{23} I^{dR}_{12} - \frac{8}{27} I'^{dR}_{23} I^{dR}_{12} e^{i(2\rho-\delta)} \right) \Delta m^2_{\bar{5},3} \right\} \lambda / m^2_{\tilde{d}}$$

$$(\delta^d_{23})_{RR} \simeq I^{dR}_{23} e^{-i(\rho-\delta)} \{ \Delta m^2_{\bar{5},2} - \Delta m^2_{\bar{5},3} \} \lambda^{0.5} / m^2_{\tilde{d}} \tag{57}$$

$$(\delta^e_{12})_{LL} \simeq -I^{eL}_{12} e^{i(\rho-\delta)} \{ \lambda^{0.5} \Delta m^2_{\bar{5},2} + (I^{dR}_{23})^2 \lambda^{1.5} \Delta m^2_{\bar{5},3} \} / m^2_{\tilde{e}} \tag{58}$$

$$(\delta^e_{13})_{LL} \simeq -I^{dR}_{23} I^{eL}_{12} \{ \Delta m^2_{\bar{5},2} - \Delta m^2_{\bar{5},3} \} \lambda / m^2_{\tilde{e}} \tag{59}$$

$$(\delta^e_{23})_{LL} \simeq I^{dR}_{23} e^{-i(\rho-\delta)} \{ \Delta m^2_{\bar{5},2} - \Delta m^2_{\bar{5},3} \} \lambda^{0.5} / m^2_{\tilde{e}} \tag{60}$$

$$(\delta^e_{12})_{RR} \simeq \{ -R^{eR}_{12} \lambda \Delta m^2_{10,2} - R^{dL}_{23} (-R^{eR}_{13} + R^{dL}_{23} R^{eR}_{12}) \lambda^5 \Delta m^2_{10,3} \} / m^2_{\tilde{e}} \tag{61}$$

$$(\delta^e_{13})_{RR} \simeq \{ -R^{dL}_{23} R^{eR}_{12} \Delta m^2_{10,2} + (-R^{eR}_{13} + R^{dL}_{23} R^{eR}_{12}) \Delta m^2_{10,3} \} \lambda^3 / m^2_{\tilde{e}} \tag{62}$$

$$(\delta^e_{23})_{RR} \simeq R^{dL}_{23} \{ \Delta m^2_{10,2} - \Delta m^2_{10,3} \} \lambda^2 / m^2_{\tilde{e}} \tag{63}$$

References

[1] H. Georgi and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. Lett. **32**, 438 (1974).

[2] L. J. Hall, H. Murayama and N. Weiner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2572 (2000) [hep-ph/9911341]; J. Hisano, K. Kurosawa and Y. Nomura, Nucl. Phys. B **584**, 3 (2000) [hep-ph/0002286].

[3] H. Fritzsch and P. Minkowski, Annals Phys. **93**, 193 (1975); F. Gursey, P. Ramond and P. Sikivie, Phys. Lett. B **60**, 177 (1976); Y. Achiman and B. Stech, Phys. Lett. B **77**, 389 (1978); R. Barbieri and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **91**, 369 (1980).

[4] T. Kugo and J. Sato, Prog. Theor. Phys. **91**, 1217 (1994) [arXiv:hep-ph/9402357]; N. Irges, S. Lavignac and P. Ramond, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 035003 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9802334]; M. Bando and T. Kugo, Prog. Theor. Phys. **101**, 1313 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9902204]; M. Bando, T. Kugo and K. Yoshioka, Prog. Theor. Phys. **104**, 211 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/0003220];

[5] M. Bando and N. Maekawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **106**, 1255 (2001) [hep-ph/0109018].

[6] M. Dine, A. Kagan, and R. Leigh, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 4269 (1993) [hep-ph/9304299]; A. Pomarol and D. Tommasini, Nucl. Phys. B **466**, 3 (1996) [hep-ph/9507462]; R. Barbieri, G. Dvali, and L.J. Hall, Phys. Lett. B **377**, 76 (1996) [hep-ph/9512388]; R. Barbieri and L.J. Hall, Nuovo Cim. A **110**, 1 (1997) [hep-ph/9605224]; K.S. Babu and S.M. Barr, Phys. Lett. B **387**, 87 (1996) [hep-ph/9606384]; R. Barbieri, L.J. Hall, S. Raby, and A. Romanino, Nucl. Phys. B **493**, 3 (1997) [hep-ph/9610449]; Z. Berezhiani, Phys. Lett. B **417**, 287 (1998) [hep-ph/9609342]; G. Eyal, Phys. Lett. B **441**, 191 (1998) [hep-ph/9807308]; R. Barbieri, P. Creminelli, and A. Romanino, Nucl. Phys. B **559**, 17 (1999) [hep-ph/9903460]; S.F. King and G.G. Ross, Phys. Lett. B **520**, 243 (2001) [hep-ph/0108112].

[7] N. Maekawa, Phys. Lett. B **561**, 273 (2003) [hep-ph/0212141]; Prog. Theor. Phys. **112**, 639 (2004) [hep-ph/0402224]; S. -G. Kim, N. Maekawa, A. Matsuzaki, K. Sakurai and T. Yoshikawa, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 115008 (2007) [hep-ph/0612370]; S. -G. Kim, N. Maekawa, A. Matsuzaki, K. Sakurai and T. Yoshikawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **121**, 49 (2009) [arXiv:0803.4250 [hep-ph]].

[8] A. Cohen, D. Kaplan and A. Nelson, Phys. Lett. B **388**, 588 (1996) [hep-ph/9607394]; N. Arkani-Hamed and H. Murayama, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 6733 (1997) [hep-ph/9703259].

[9] For the review, L. Randall and C. Csaki, In *Palaiseau 1995, SUSY 95* 99-109 [hep-ph/9508208].

[10] E. Witten, Phys. Lett. B **149** (1984),351; M. Dine, N. Seiberg and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **289** (1987), 589; J.J. Atick, L.J. Dixon and A. Sen, Nucl. Phys. B **292** (1987),109; M. Dine, I. Ichinose and N. Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. B **293** (1987),253.

[11] N. Maekawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **106**, 401 (2001) [hep-ph/0104200]; Prog. Theor. Phys. **107**, 597 (2002) [hep-ph/0111205]; N. Maekawa and T. Yamashita, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 121801 (2003) [hep-ph/0209217]; Prog. Theor. Phys. **107**, 1201 (2002) [hep-ph/0202050]; Prog. Theor. Phys. **110**, 93 (2003) [hep-ph/0303207].

[12] N. Maekawa, Phys. Lett. B **521**, 42 (2001) [hep-ph/0107313].

[13] R. Hempfling, Phys. Lett. B **329**, 222 (1994) [hep-ph/9404257];

[14] J. Hisano and Y. Shimizu, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 093001 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0406091]; K. V. P. Latha, D. Angom, B. P. Das and

D. Mukherjee, arXiv:0902.4790 [physics.atom-ph]; J. R. Ellis, J. S. Lee and A. Pilaftsis, JHEP **0810**, 049 (2008) [arXiv:0808.1819 [hep-ph]].

[15] M. Ishiduki, S. -G. Kim, N. Maekawa and K. Sakurai, Prog. Theor. Phys. **122**, 659 (2009) [arXiv:0901.3400 [hep-ph]]; Phys. Rev. D **80**, 115011 (2009) [Erratum-ibid. D **81**, 039901 (2010)] [arXiv:0910.1336 [hep-ph]]; @ H. Kawase and N. Maekawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **123**, 941 (2010) [arXiv:1005.1049 [hep-ph]].

[16] N. Maekawa and K. Takayama, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 095015 (2012) [arXiv:1202.5816 [hep-ph]].

[17] N. Maekawa and Y. Muramatsu, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 095008 (2013) [arXiv:1307.7529].

[18] N. Maekawa and Y. Muramatsu, arXiv:1401.2633 [hep-ph].

[19] J. S. Hagelin and S. Kelley, Nucl. Phys. B **342**, 95 (1990); Y. Kawamura, H. Murayama and M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Lett. B **324**, 52 (1994) [hep-ph/9402254]; Phys. Rev. D **51**, 1337 (1995) [hep-ph/9406245]; Y. Kawamura and M. Tanaka, Prog. Theor. Phys. **91**, 949 (1994).

[20] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 1 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7214 [hep-ex]]; S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 30 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex]].

[21] K. Inoue, K. Kojima and K. Yoshioka, JHEP **0707**, 027 (2007) [hep-ph/0703253].

[22] F. Gabbiani, E. Gabrielli, A. Masiero and L. Silvestrini, Nucl. Phys. B **477**, 321 (1996) [hep-ph/9604387]; M. Ciuchini, V. Lubicz, L. Conti, A. Vladikas, A. Donini, E. Franco, G. Martinelli and I. Scimemi *et al.*, JHEP **9810**, 008 (1998) [hep-ph/9808328].

[23] N. Maekawa and K. Takayama, arXiv:1403.7629 [hep-ph].



Figure 1: Allowed region in $(\Delta m_{\bar{5},2}/m_{\tilde{d}},\ \Delta m_{10,2}/m_{\tilde{d}} = \Delta m_{\bar{5},3}/m_{\tilde{d}})$ space. The allowed region for the condition of $\sqrt{|\mathrm{Im}(\delta^d_{12})_{LL}(\delta^d_{12})_{RR}|}$ is obtained below the solid lines for various $m_{\tilde{d}} = 5$ TeV, 10 TeV, 20 TeV and 40 TeV. The allowed region for $\sqrt{|\mathrm{Im}(\delta^d_{12})^2_{RR}|}$ is the left side of the dotted line for $m_{\tilde{d}} = 40$ TeV. The other conditions are satisfied in the allowed region for $\sqrt{|\mathrm{Im}(\delta^d_{12})_{LL}(\delta^d_{12})_{RR}|}$.